arXiv:1606.03881v2 [math.NT] 21 Jun 2016

Length of the continued logarithm algorithm on rational inputs

Jeffrey Shallit
School of Computer Science
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1
Canada
shallit@cs.uwaterloo.ca

June 22, 2016

Abstract

The continued logarithm algorithm was introduced by Gosper around 1978, and recently studied by Borwein, Calkin, Lindstrom, and Mattingly. In this note I show that the continued logarithm algorithm terminates in at most $2\log_2 p + O(1)$ steps on input a rational number $p/q \geq 1$. Furthermore, this bound is tight, up to an additive constant.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{Z}$ denote the integers, $\mathbb{N}$ denote the non-negative integers, and $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ denote the positive integers.

The continued fraction algorithm, which expands every real number x in an expression of the form

$$x = a_0 + \cfrac{1}{a_1 + \cfrac{1}{a_2 + \cfrac{1}{a_3 + \ddots}}},$$

with $a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ for $i \geq 1$, has been extensively studied, in part because of its relationship to the Euclidean algorithm. In particular, it is known that this expression is essentially unique, and terminates with final term a_n if and only if x is a rational number. In this case, if $x = p/q$, the length of the expansion is at most $O(\log pq)$, as has been known since the 1841 work of Finck [6]. Furthermore, examples achieving this bound are known.

Around 1978, Gosper [5] introduced an analogue of the continued fraction algorithm for real numbers, called the *continued logarithm algorithm*, which expands every real number $x \geq 1$ in an expression of the form

$$x = 2^{k_0}(1 + \cfrac{1}{2^{k_1}(1 + \cfrac{1}{2^{k_2}(1 + \cfrac{1}{2^{k_3}(1 + \cdot_{\cdot_{\cdot}})})})}) \quad . \tag{1}$$

where $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for $i \geq 0$. More recently, this algorithm was studied by Brabec [2, 3, 4] and Borwein, Calkin, Lindstrom, and Mattingly [1].

Once again, it is known that this expression is essentially unique and terminates if and only if x is rational. However, up to now, no estimate of the length of the expansion has been given. In this note, we provide such an estimate.

2 The continued logarithm algorithm

As described by Borwein, Calkin, Lindstrom, and Mattingly [1], the continued logarithm algorithm can be described as follows: for $x > 1$ we define

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{2}, & \text{if } x \geq 2; \\ \frac{1}{x-1}, & \text{if } 1 < x < 2. \end{cases}$$

The algorithm proceeds by iterating g until the result is 1; the division steps $x \to x/2$ are done repeatedly until the transformation $x \to \frac{1}{x-1}$ is used, or $x = 1$. In the latter case the algorithm terminates. The number of division steps is given by the number of k's in the expansion (1). For example,

$$\frac{96}{7} = 2^3(1 + \cfrac{1}{2^0(1 + \cfrac{1}{2^1(1 + \cfrac{1}{2^2})})}) \quad . \tag{2}$$

We can abbreviate the expression (1) by writing $x = \langle k_0, k_1, \ldots, k_n \rangle$. So $\frac{96}{7} = \langle 3, 0, 1, 2 \rangle$. Similarly, $2^k = \langle k \rangle$ for $k \geq 0$. Since the continued logarithm expansion is unique, we can regard an expression like $x = \langle k_0, k_1, \ldots, k_n \rangle$ as *either* an evaluation of a certain function on the right, or as a statement about the output of the continued logarithm algorithm on an input x. We trust there will be no confusion on the proper interpretation in what follows.

There are two different natural measures of the complexity of the algorithm on rational inputs. The first is the number of steps $n+1$ in $x = \langle k_0, k_1, \ldots, k_n \rangle$, which we write as $L(x)$. The second is the *total* number of division steps $k_0 + k_1 + \cdots + k_n$, which we write as $T(x)$. In this note we get asymptotically tight bounds for L and T on rational numbers $p/q \geq 1$.

3 The bound on L

Consider performing the continued logarithm algorithm CL on a rational input $\frac{p}{q} \geq 1$, getting back $\frac{p}{q} = \langle k_0, k_1, \ldots, k_n \rangle$. We can associate a rational number $\frac{p}{q}$ with the pair (p, q). While this association is not unique (for example, 2 can be represented by $(2, 1)$ or $(4, 2)$), it does not create problems in what follows. By consolidating the division steps, we can express the continued logarithm algorithm on rational numbers as a function of two integers that takes its value on finite lists, as follows

$$\mathrm{CL}(p, q) = \begin{cases} k, & \text{if } p = 2^k q \text{ for some } k \geq 0; \\ k, \mathrm{CL}(2^k q, p - 2^k q), & \text{if } 1 < \frac{p}{2^k q} < 2; \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Here the comma denotes concatenation.

The idea of our bound on L is to consider how the measure $f(p, q) = p^2 + q^2$ changes as the algorithm proceeds.

In our interpretation of the algorithm on pairs (p, q), it replaces (p, q) with (p', q'), where $p' = 2^k q$ and $q' = p - 2^k q$ for $1 \leq \frac{p}{2^k q} < 2$, and terminates when $q = 0$. First we show that $f(p, q)$ strictly decreases in each step of the algorithm.

Lemma 1. *If the continued logarithm algorithm takes (p, q) to (p', q'), then $f(p', q') < f(p, q)$.*

Proof. From the inequality $\frac{p}{q \cdot 2^k} \geq 1$ we get

$$\frac{p}{q} \geq 2^k > 2^k - \frac{1}{2^{k+1}}.$$

Multiplying by $2^{k+1} q^2$, we get $2^{k+1} pq > (2^{2k+1} - 1) q^2$. Adding p^2 to both sides and rearranging gives

$$\begin{aligned} p^2 + q^2 &> p^2 - 2^{k+1} pq + 2^{2k+1} q^2 \\ &= (2^k q)^2 + (p - 2^k q)^2 \\ &= (p')^2 + (q')^2, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Next we show how f decreases as the algorithm proceeds. We use the notation $(p, q) \to^k (p', q')$ to denote that one step of the algorithm replaces p/q with p'/q', where $p' = 2^k q$ and $q' = p - 2^k q$.

Lemma 2. *If $(p, q) \to^0 (p', q')$ then $f(p', q') \leq f(p, q)/2$.*

Proof. The condition $k = 0$ implies $p' = q$ and $q' = p - q$. Then $1 \leq \frac{p}{q} < 2$. If $\frac{p}{q} = 1$ then the algorithm terminates, so assume $\frac{p}{q} > 1$. Write $\frac{p}{q} = c$. If $1 < c \leq 2$, then $(c - 1)(c - 3) < 0$. Multiplying by q^2 gives $q^2(c^2 - 4c + 3) < 0$. Hence, using the fact that $p = cq$, we get $p^2 - 4pq + 3q^2 < 0$. Dividing by 2 and rearranging, we get $f(p', q') = q^2 + (p - q)^2 < \frac{1}{2}(p^2 + q^2) < \frac{1}{2} f(p, q)$. □

Lemma 3. *If two steps of the continued logarithm algorithm are* $(p,q) \to^k (p',q') \to^0 (p'',q'')$ *with* $k \geq 1$ *then* $f(p'',q'') < \frac{1}{4} f(p,q)$.

Proof. The first step implies that $1 < \frac{p}{2^k q} < 2$, and $p' = 2^k q$, $q' = p - 2^k q$. The second step implies that $1 < \frac{2^k q}{p - 2^k q} < 2$ and $p'' = p - 2^k q$, $q'' = 2^{k+1} q - p$.

Define $c = \frac{p}{2^k q}$ and observe that the inequalities of the previous paragraph imply $3/2 \leq c \leq 2$. Consider the polynomial $h(c) = 7c^2 - 24c + 20$. Since the roots of this polynomial are $10/7$ and 2, we clearly see that $h(c) \leq 0$ for $3/2 \leq c \leq 2$. Hence $q^2(7c^2 - 24c + 20)2^{2k} < q^2$ for $q \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$. Substituting $c = \frac{p}{2^k q}$ and simplifying gives $7p^2 - 24 \cdot 2^k pq + 20 \cdot 2^{2k} q^2 < q^2$. Adding p^2 to both sides and then dividing by 4 gives $2p^2 - 6 \cdot 2^k pq + 5 \cdot 2^{2k} q^2 < \frac{1}{4}(p^2 + q^2)$. But the left side of this inequality is $(p - 2^k q)^2 + (q 2^{k+1} - p)^2$. Thus we have proved $(p'')^2 + (q'')^2 < \frac{1}{4}(p^2 + q^2)$. □

Lemma 4. *If two steps of the continued logarithm algorithm are* $(p,q) \to^k (p',q') \to^{k'} (p'',q'')$ *with* $k, k' \geq 1$*, then* p'' *and* q'' *are both divisible by 2, and* $f(p''/2, q''/2) < \frac{1}{4} f(p,q)$.

Proof. In that case the first step replaces (p,q) by $(p',q') = (q \cdot 2^k, p - q \cdot 2^k)$, and the second step replaces this latter pair with

$$(p'',q'') = ((p - q \cdot 2^k)2^{k'}, q(2^{k+k'} + 2^k) - p \cdot 2^{k'}).$$

Now both elements of this latter pair are divisible by $2^{\min(k,k')} \geq 2$. Since these correspond to numerator and denominator, we can divide both elements of the pair by 2 and obtain an equivalent pair of integers $(p''/2, q''/2)$. Note that $\mathrm{CL}(p'',q'') = \mathrm{CL}(p''/2, q''/2)$. By Lemma 3 we have $f(p''/2, q''/2) = \frac{1}{4} f(p'',q'') < \frac{1}{4} f(p',q') < \frac{1}{4} f(p,q)$, as desired. □

Theorem 5. *On input* $p/q \geq 1$ *the continued logarithm algorithm uses at most* $2\log_2 p + 2$ *steps.*

Proof. Consider the continued logarithm expansion and process it from left to right as follows: if a term is 0, use Lemma 2. If a term is $k \geq 1$, group it with the term that follows and use either Lemma 3 or Lemma 4. By doing so we group all terms except possibly the last. Lemma 2 shows that a single step reduces f by a factor of 2. Lemmas 3 and 4 show that two steps reduce f by a factor of 4. Thus the total number of steps on input (p,q) is at most $\log_2(p^2 + q^2) + 1$, where the $+1$ term takes into account the last term that might be ungrouped.

So the algorithm uses at most $\log_2(p^2 + q^2) + 1$ steps. Since $p \geq q$, we have $\log_2(p^2 + q^2) + 1 \leq \log_2(2p^2) + 1 \leq \log_2(p^2) + 2 \leq (2\log_2 p) + 2$. □

A nearly matching lower bound of $2\log_2 p + O(1)$ is achievable, as the following class of examples shows:

Theorem 6. *On input* $2^n - 1$ *the continued logarithm algorithm takes* $2n - 2$ *steps.*

Proof. We have $2^n - 1 = \langle n-1, 0, n-2, 0, \ldots, 2, 0, 1, 1 \rangle$, as can be easily proved by induction. □

4 The bound on T

Theorem 7. *Let* $\frac{p}{q} \geq 1$. *Then* $T(\frac{p}{q}) < (\log_2 p)(2\log_2 p + 2)$.

Proof. As the continued logarithm algorithm proceeds, the numerators strictly decrease, so each k is bounded by $\log_2 p$. The number of steps is bounded by Theorem 5. □

Theorem 8. *For* $n \geq 1$ *we have* $T(2^n - 1) = n(n-1)/2 + 1$.

Proof. Follows immediately from the expansion $2^n - 1 = \langle n-1, 0, n-2, 0, \ldots, 2, 0, 1, 1\rangle$ given in the proof of Theorem 3. □

5 Open problems

1. What is the average case behavior of the number of steps of the continued logarithm algorithm on rational numbers p/q, with $q < p < 2q$, as $q \to \infty$?

2. Is the sequence $(L(n))_{n\geq 1}$ a k-regular sequence for any $k \geq 2$? The available numerical evidence suggests not.

References

[1] Jonathan M. Borwein, Neil J. Calkin, Scott B. Lindstrom, and Andrew Mattingly. Continued logarithms and associated continued fractions. Preprint, May 11 2016, available at https://www.carma.newcastle.edu.au/jon/clogs.pdf.

[2] Tomáš Brabec. Hardware implementation of continued logarithm arithmetic. In *Scientific Computing, Computer Arithmetic and Validated Numerics, 2006. SCAN 2006*, IEEE, 2006, pp. 1–9.

[3] Tomáš Brabec. On progress of investigations in continued logarithms. Preprint. Available at http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.93.4552&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

[4] Tomáš Brabec. Speculatively redundant continued logarithm representation. *IEEE Trans. Computers* **59** (2010), 1441–1454.

[5] Bill Gosper. Continued fraction arithmetic. Unpublished manuscript, c. 1978. Available at http://perl.plover.com/classes/cftalk/INFO/gosper.txt or http://www.tweedledum.com/rwg/cfup.htm.

[6] J. Shallit. Origins of the analysis of the Euclidean algorithm. *Historia Math.* **21** (1994), 401–419.